

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

Lesa Meranda,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No.:1:12-cv-1397
)	
Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

**COMPLAINT SEEKING DAMAGES FOR VIOLATION OF
THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT**

Introduction

1. This is an action for actual and statutory damages, legal fees and costs pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et. seq (hereinafter referred to as the “FDCPA”), which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive, and unfair practices. Id.
2. The purpose of the FDCPA is to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses. Id.
3. If a violation occurs, “the FDCPA is a strict liability statute that makes debt collectors liable for violations that are not knowing or intentional.” Hahn vs. Triumph Partnerships, LLC, 557 F.3d 755, 758 (7th Cir. 2009).
4. Even a single violation of the FDCPA is sufficient to support liability. Taylor vs. Perrin, Landry, deLaundry, deLauneay, & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232, 1238 (5th Cir. 1997).

Jurisdiction

5. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d).

Venue

6. Venue is proper in this Judicial District

7. The acts and transactions alleged herein occurred in this Judicial District.
8. The Plaintiff resides in this Judicial District.
9. The Defendant transacts business in this Judicial District.

Parties

10. The Plaintiff, Lesa Meranda, is a natural person.
11. The Plaintiff is a “consumer” as that term is defined by § 1692a.
12. The Plaintiff is “any person” as that term is used in 15 U.S.C. § 1692d preface.
13. The Defendant, Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC, (hereinafter referred to as “Defendant”), is a debt collection agency and/or purchaser operating from an address at 120 Corporate Boulevard, Suite 100, Norfolk, VA 23502.
14. The Defendant is a debt collection agency; however, the Defendant is licensed by the State of Indiana. *See Exhibit “1” attached hereto.*
15. Defendant regularly attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another.
16. The Defendant regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another that arose out of transactions in which the money, property or services which are the subject of the transactions are primarily for personal, family or household purposes.

Factual Allegations

17. The Defendant is a debt collection agency attempting to collect a debt from Plaintiff.
18. The Plaintiff incurred a debt to that was for primarily for personal, family or household purposes as defined by §1692(a)(5).
19. The debt owed by Plaintiff went into default.
20. After the debt went into default the debt was placed or otherwise transferred to the Defendant for collection.
21. The Plaintiff disputes the debt.
22. The Plaintiff requests that the Defendant cease all further communication on the debt.
23. The Defendant’s collector(s) were employee(s) and/or representative(s) of the Defendant at all times mentioned herein.

24. The Defendant acted at all times mentioned herein through its employee(s) and/or legal representative(s).
25. Prior to March 7, 2012, the Plaintiff retained John Steinkamp & Associates for legal representation regarding the Plaintiff's debts.
26. At some point the Defendant hired Wright & Lerch as its agent to attempt to collect a debt from the Plaintiff.
27. On or about February 28, 2012, the Plaintiff received a letter from Wright & Lerch, agents of the Defendant, in an attempt to collect a debt. *See Exhibit "2" attached hereto*
28. On March 7, 2012, the Plaintiff's legal counsel sent a letter to Wright & Lerch via facsimile. This letter indicated that John Steinkamp & Associates represents the Plaintiff regarding the debt that the Defendant, through Wright & Lerch, is attempting to collect. This facsimile transmission to the Defendant's agent was successfully received by Wright & Lerch. *See Exhibit "3" attached hereto.*
29. Communications sent via facsimile are assumed to have been received by the intended recipient if the facsimile confirmation indicates a successful transmission. *See Laouini v. CLM Freight Lines, Inc.*, 586 F.3d 473 (7th Cir., 2009)(holding that facsimile confirmation generated by the...fax machine was sufficient to create a factual dispute that ...was received...); *Bridgeview Health Care Center Ltd. v. Clark*, 2011 WL 4585028, 3 (N.D.Ill 2011)("Indeed, in the facsimile transmission context, it is commonly understood that 'success' means that 'the two fax machines have performed an electronic "handshake" and that the data has been transmitted from one machine to the other.").
30. On August 15, 2012, the Plaintiff received a voicemail message from "Kimberly", an employee of Wright & Lerch. *See Exhibit "4" attached hereto.*
31. On August 16, 2012, the Plaintiff spoke with "David", an employee of Wright & Lerch. *See Exhibit "4" attached hereto.*
32. During this telephone conversation, David told the Plaintiff that he could still call her in attempting to collect a debt. *See Exhibit "4" attached hereto.*
33. During this telephone conversation, David refused to take down the Plaintiff's attorney information, in addition to attempting to negotiate the amount due, despite notice of legal representation sent on March 7, 2012. *See Exhibit "4" attached hereto.*
34. The Defendant's collection communications are to be interpreted under the "unsophisticated consumer" standard. *See Gammon vs. GC Services, Ltd. Partnership*, 27 F.3d 1254, 1257 (7th Cir. 1994).

**First Claim for Relief:
Violation of the FDCPA**

1. The allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 34 of the complaint are realleged and incorporated herewith by references.
2. The Defendant violated the FDCPA by continuing to contact the Plaintiff through its agent Wright & Lerch in an attempt to collect a debt despite notice of legal representation, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692c.
3. The Defendant's acts and omissions intended to harass the Plaintiff in violation of the FDCPA pursuant to the preface of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d by continuing to attempt to collect a debt from a consumer that the Defendant knew was represented by legal counsel.
4. The Defendant's acts and omissions constitute unfair and unconscionable attempts to collect a debt in violation of the FDCPA pursuant to the preface of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f by continuing to attempt to collect a debt from a consumer that the Defendant knew was represented by legal counsel.
5. The Defendant misrepresented that it was able to contact the Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt during the conversation on August 16, 2012, despite knowledge of legal representation, which constitutes a violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
6. As a result of the above violations of the FDCPA, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for actual damages, statutory damages of \$1,000 per defendant, attorney fees, and costs.

Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that the Court grant the following:

1. A finding that the Defendant violated the FDCPA and/or an admission from the Defendant that it violated the FDCPA.
2. Actual damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1).
3. Statutory damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A).
4. Reasonable attorneys fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3).
5. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John T. Steinkamp

John T. Steinkamp

John Steinkamp and Associates

Attorney for Plaintiff

5218 S. East Street, Suite E1

Indianapolis, IN 46227

Office: (317) 780-8300

Fax: (317) 217-1320

Email: steinkamplaw@yahoo.com